REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 are amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1-8, 17 and 18 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination of Adiwoso and Schiff, claims 9 and 10 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination of Adiwoso, Schiff and Hreha, claims 11-14 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination Adiwoso, Schiff and Setoyama, and claims 15 and 16 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination of Adiwoso, Schiff and Sharon.

The presently claimed invention is directed to an integrated multispot satellite communication system in a multimedia broadcasting network with a return channel. A satellite receives a multimedia broadcast signal from a provider and transmits said multimedia broadcast signal to a user in response to a request from said user. Further, common means of burst synchronisation is provided, such that the transmission rate in a downlink direction from the satellite is a whole multiple of a clock reference of said network. A network controller receives different return channels from said user and said provider, via said satellite. A signalling part of said multimedia broadcast signal is addressed from said provider to said network controller, and a period of the downlink frame is equal to a period of the uplink frame, because different uplink channels are inserted into a downlink signal in a synchronous manner.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Adiwoso fails to disclose or suggest "common means of burst synchronization such that the transmission rate in a downlink direction from the satellite

is a whole multiple of a clock reference of said network" and "a period of the downlink frame is equal to a period of the uplink frame", as recited in independent claims 1 and 5. Further, the Examiner admits that Adiwoso fails to disclose "different uplink channels from a service provider and a user are inserted into a downlink signal in a synchronous manner", as recited in claims 1 and 5 as amended, but previously recited in claims 4 and 8. To overcome these admitted deficiencies with respect to this claim limitation, the Examiner has proposed to combine Schiff with Adiwoso.

Adiwoso discloses a satellite-based direct access telecommunication system. The power and bandwidth is partitioned between the gateways and the user terminals. As explained at column 5, lines 51-67, Adiwoso teaches that the links are asymmetrical, such that the uplink includes a large amount of information and the downlink includes very little information. Adiwoso teaches that such an asymmetric allocation of resources represents the optimum use of the satellite's resources. Adiwoso is silent as to the period and frame length, and does not disclose synchronization to maintain equality between the uplink and downlink, but as explained above, actually teaches asymmetry.

Schiff discloses a regenerative subtransponder satellite communication system. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Schiff alone does not disclose a multimedia broadcasting network. Further, the system of Schiff is directed to earth stations sharing an uplink carrier, but does not at all distinguish between the types of earth stations. For example, but not by way of limitation, there is no definition of a particular earth station as a broadcaster and another earth station as a receiver, and another earth station as a controller. Further, as asserted by the

Examiner, Schiff teaches that the uplink frame period and the downlink frame period are equal to one another, or in other words, they are symmetrical. The Examiner cites to column 3, lines 1-5 (uplink) and 55-58 (downlink).

Column 4, lines 19-25 of Schiff disclose *sequentially* reading out and transmitting buffered data on a single downlink carrier. However, applicant respectfully submits that Schiff does not disclose that the foregoing scheme would result in a period of a downlink frame being equal to a period of an uplink frame. Further, applicant respectfully submits that this passage of Schiff does not disclose or suggest that the *user* and the *service provider* both provide the uplink channels that are being included in the downlink signal. In other words, Schiff does not disclose the source of the M uplink channels.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because the proposed combination of Schiff and Adiwoso is improper. More specifically, applicant respectfully submits that Adiwoso and Schiff teach away from one another with respect to a critical feature of the claimed invention, as explained below.

Applicant respectfully submits that by teaching asymmetrical links, Adiwoso teaches away from the purported symmetrical links of Schiff. The Examiner has proposed to combine Schiff with Adiwoso for this particular feature, and the Examiner asserts that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to make such a combination based on more efficient use of bandwidth. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position, and instead respectfully submits that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have viewed Adiwoso as teaching that asymmetry is beneficial for optimum use of resources. If one

skilled in the art at the time of the invention was then presented with Schiff, applicant respectfully submits that the person skilled in the art would have rejected the symmetry of Schiff, because Schiff teaches away from the optimum usage of resources that is taught by Adiwoso.

Separately, applicant respectfully submits that Adiwoso also teaches away from the presently claimed invention, for at least the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's proposed combination of Adiwoso and Schiff is improper, and thus, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of the claims.

Additionally, applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 or 5, which are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
/Mainak H. Mehta/
Mainak H. Mehta
Registration No. 46,924

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 17, 2008